

**REMARKS**

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Final Office Action dated February 13, 2008 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

Claims 1-14 and 16-23 are rejected by the Office. Claim 12 is objected to as containing informalities. With this response, claims 1-5, 12, 19, 21, and 22 are hereby amended. No new matter has been added. Accordingly, claims 1-14 and 16-23 are pending in the application.

In the Office Action, claims 19 and 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,677,741 to Yui (hereinafter “Yui”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,046,255 to D’Souza et al. (hereinafter “D’Souza”). Claims 1-14, 16-18, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yui in view of D’Souza and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,008,786 to Kimura et al. (hereinafter “Kimura”).

With response to the objection to claim 12, claim 12 has been amended to remove the inadvertent typographic error identified by the Office, and Applicants request that the objection to claim 12 be withdrawn.

The rejection of claims 19 and 21-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yui and in view of D’Souza et al. is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Independent Claim 19 recites a method of driving a display device having a combination of features including, for example, “compensating a displayable color by analyzing the displayable color in the received image information, and replacing the B color gray scale value in the received image information with a B color value at gray scale immediately prior to the level to begin reducing a color reproducibility retrieved from the lookup table in response to a determination that the B color gray scale value of the displayable color in the received image information is greater than the predetermined reference gray scale level to begin reducing a color reproducibility, and retrieving at least one of an R color value and a G color value from the lookup table to be mixed with the received image information to compensate the displayable color in response to the determination that the B color value of the displayable color is greater

than the reference gray scale level to begin reducing a color reproducibility.” The cited references do not teach or suggest at least this feature of the claimed invention.

In rejection of claim 19, The Examiner acknowledges that Yui “does not expressly disclose wherein the gray scale data for the second display color is retrieved using the gray value of the image received by the image information corresponding to the first color displayable by the display device.” See Office Action, lines 1-3 page 4. Accordingly, Applicants submit that Yui does not teach or suggest at least “retrieving at least one of an R color value and a G color value from the lookup table to be mixed with the received image information to compensate the displayable color in response to the determination that the B color value of the displayable color is greater than the reference gray scale level to begin reducing a color reproducibility” as recited in claim 19.

As allegedly curing this deficiency in the teaching of Yui, the Examiner cites D’Souza as teaching “wherein the gray scale data for the second display color is retrieved using the gray value of the image received by the image information corresponding to the first color displayable by the display device.” See Office Action, lines 4-12 page 4.

Applicant respectfully disagrees that D’Souza cures the deficiency in the teachings of Yui. As the Examiner acknowledged in the Office Action, Figure 5 of D’Souza “demonstrates that all the colors are compensated based on each other’s color reproducibility.” For example, at this time, all the compensated color values including the B color are calculated according to a detailed multi-equation as shown in Figs. 3 and 4. Accordingly, Applicants submit that D’Souza does not teach or suggest “retrieving at least one of an R color value and a G color value from the lookup table to be mixed with the received image information to compensate the displayable color in response to the determination that the B color value of the displayable color is greater than the reference gray scale level to begin reducing a color reproducibility” as recited in claim 19.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 21-23 and reconsideration is respectfully requested. Claims 21-23 are allowable at least by virtue of the fact that they depend from claim 19, which is allowable.

The rejection of claims 1-14 and 16-18, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yui and D'Souza and further in view of Kimura is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested. Applicants submit that Yui, D'Souza, and Kimura, analyzed singly or in combination, do not teach or suggest the combined features of the claims.

Independent claim 1 recites a liquid crystal display device having a combination of features including, for example, “a data processing unit that analyzes the displayable color in received image information, replaces the B color value in the received image information with a B color value at gray scale immediately prior to the level to begin reducing a color reproducibility retrieved from the lookup table in response to a determination that the B color value in the received image information is greater than a reference gray scale level to begin reducing the color reproducibility, and that outputs a compensated displayable color, and wherein in response to the determination that the B color value of the displayable color is greater than the reference gray scale level to begin reducing a color reproducibility, the data processing unit retrieves at least one of an R color value and a G color value from the lookup table to be mixed with the received image information to compensate the displayable color.”

Applicants submit that D'Souza and Yui do not disclose at least “and wherein in response to the determination that the B color value of the displayable color is greater than the reference gray scale level to begin reducing a color reproducibility, the data processing unit retrieves at least one of an R color value and a G color value from the lookup table to be mixed with the received image information to compensate the displayable color” as recited in claim 1 for reasons similar to those given above for claim 19. The Examiner further cites Kimura as disclosing that the display “is a LCD panel with the requisite control circuitry.” Applicants do not reach the Examiner’s conclusions regarding the teachings of Kimura. Applicants submit that Kimura does not cure the deficiencies in the teachings of D'Souza and Yui and that claim 1 is allowable over D'Souza, Yui, and Kimura at least because D'Souza, Yui, and Kimura, analyzed singly or in any combination do not teach or suggest at least the above quoted combination of features of claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is allowable over the cited references.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of the claims 2-11 and reconsideration is respectfully requested. Claims 2-11 are allowable at least by virtue of the fact that they depend from claim 1, which is allowable. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-11.

Independent Claim 12 recites a method of driving a display device having a combination of features including, for example, “increasing a gray scale value of a B color of a red (R), green (G), and blue (B) color of the LCD device; detecting during the increasing the gray scale value of the B color, a gray scale value of B color at which a color reproducibility of the LCD device is reduced.”

In rejecting claim 12, the Office cites Yui as teaching the above identified features of the claim, in particular citing Figs. 6A-1-6C1, 6a2-6c2, and column 4 of Yui. See page 12 of the Office Action. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Office’s conclusion regarding the teachings of Yui.

Yui discloses a system for addressing “When Host Color Space > Display Color Space” by determining that the display color space is less than the host color spaces. The determination is made by comparing host profile information to display profile information. Based on the determination, clipping of processing according to Figs. 6A-1 to 6C-1 is performed adjusting “portions other than the clipped portions” according to Figs. 6A-2 to 6C-2. See Yui column 4, line 30 through column 5, line 10. Yui does not disclose or suggest the method for determining profile information for the host or the display. Accordingly, Applicants submit that Yui does not teach or suggest at least “increasing a gray scale value of a B color of a red (R), green (G), and blue (B) color of the LCD device; detecting during the increasing the gray scale value of the B color, a gray scale value of B color at which a color reproducibility of the LCD device is reduced” as recited in claim 12. Applicants further submit that this deficiency in the teachings of Yui is not cured by D’Souza or Kimura, and that Yui, D-Souza, and Kimura, analyzed singly or in any combination do not teach or suggest at least combination of features recited in claim 12.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 12 is allowable over the cited references.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of the claims 13, 14, and 16-18 and reconsideration is respectfully requested. Claims 13, 14, and 16-18 are allowable at least by virtue of the fact that they depend from claim 12, which is allowable for at least the reasons given above.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of the claim 20 and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claim 20 is allowable over Yui and D'Souza at least by virtue of the fact that claim 20 depends from claim 19, which is allowable. Further, Kimura, cited by the Examiner as disclosing that the display "is a LCD panel with the requisite control circuitry" does not cure the deficiencies in the teachings of Yui and D'Souza discussed above regarding claim 19. According, claim 19, and claim 20 depending from claim 19 are allowable over Yui, and Kimura at least because D'Souza, Yui, and Kimura, analyzed singly or in any combination do not teach or suggest the combined of features of claim 19 as identified in the discussion of claim 19 above.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 20.

Applicants believe the foregoing amendment and remarks place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the

filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. *A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.*

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 8, 2008

By Valerie P. Hayes

Valerie P. Hayes

Registration No. 53,005

McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP

1900 K Street, N.W.

Washington, DC 20006

(202) 496-7500

Attorneys for Applicants

filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. *A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.*

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 8, 2008

By Valerie P. Hayes

**Valerie P. Hayes**

Registration No. 53,005

MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP

1900 K Street, N.W.

Washington, DC 20006

(202) 496-7500

Attorneys for Applicants